SUBJECTS.

rules for the settlement of these lands have already been issued. As soon as the survey is over, the question whether these rules require any revision, will be considered before any settlement is finally done. I shall then look into the question of acreage value complained of.

PATHANAPURAM TALUK.

93. *Construction of irrigation works.*

Mr. Padmanabhan Narayanan (Member, Pathanapuram Taluk) said that, owing to the failure of the monsoon, cultivation suffered greatly in the taluk. Effect was not given to the provisions of the Irrigation Regulation relating to the construction of irrigation works. For that purpose, it was necessary to pass rules under the Regulation. This had been brought up by the Changanachery Member at the fourth session and action was promised after obtaining a report from the Peishkar.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

94. *Opening of roads.*

Mr. Padmanahhan Parameswaran (Member, Pathanapuram Taluk) requested that three roads might be opened in the taluk, *viz.*, (1) from Kunnicode to Pathanapuram, (2) from Kunnicode to Kalayapuram and (3) from Kunnicode to the Anchal market. The roads asked for were only 3, 4 and 5 miles respectively. When the subject was brought up last year, Government said that two of the roads had been included in the programme and that the works would be taken up as soon as funds became available. He prayed for the early construction of the roads.

Dewan's reply.—An investigation has been ordered in regard to the first road, and till that is over, nothing can be done. The roads from Kunnicode to Kalayapuram and to the Anchal market are not said to be important.

KUNNATTUR TALUK.

95. *Opening of a dispensary at Adur.*

Mr. K. N. Govinda Pillai (Member, Kunnattur Taluk) said that the people of the taluk had no facilities for medical aid and requested that a dispensary might be established at Adur or the one at Punalur transferred to Adur.

Dewan's reply.—A dispensary was tried at the place and was abolished two years ago as it was not found to be useful. The request of the Member is noted.

KARUNAGAPALLI TALUK.

96. *Improvement of communications*

Mr. P. Kesava Pillai (Member, Karunagapalli Taluk) requested that the following works might be carried out:—

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

(1) construction of a road from Neendakara to Kayenculam. The Member said that a mile of the road had already been gravelled. If the remaining distance of 7 miles were also completed, it would connect Kayenculam and Patanayarkulangara.

(2) provision of a bridge across the Krishnapuram canal near the Munsiff's Court.

(3) extension of the Thamarakulam road to Ayiramthengu.

Dewan's reply.—Noted.

97. *Transfer of the Krishnapuram Munsiff's Court to Karunagapalli.*

Mr. A. E. Padmanabha Kurup.—(Member, Karunagapalli Taluk) said that of the eight proverthies of the taluk, Karunagapalli was the most important. Three of them were at present under the jurisdiction of the Quilon Munsiff's Court and the remaining five under that of the Krishnapuram Munsiff's Court, which was located in the north-western corner of the taluk. Krishnapuram was a sparsely inhabited place. For want of a treasury close to the Court, the litigant public experienced great inconvenience in the matter of obtaining chellans, the treasury at Kayenculam being two miles away from the Court. By the transfer of the Court to Karunagapalli, it would be possible to effect a retrenchment in the expenditure by abolishing the Additional Munsiff's Court at Quilon and the treasury at Kayenculam. The change would also be a great boon to the people. Instead of the 10 proverthies now included in the jurisdiction of the Krishnapuram Court, 13 proverthies might be brought under the jurisdiction of the proposed Court at Karunagapalli. He added that the transfer of the Krishnapuram Munsiff's Court to Kayenculam, which he understood to be under proposal before Government, would give no relief to the people of the taluk and the Member prayed therefore for its transfer to Karunagapalli.

Dewan's reply.—Before the redistribution of the territorial jurisdiction of the Munsiffs' Courts, this question was fully considered by the High Court. The Chief Justice studied the question thoroughly on the spot with reference to local conditions and he came to the conclusion that the transfer proposed by the Member was not desirable for several reasons. Government concur with the opinion of the High Court.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly